
Subject: Re: Triple sbh - almost guaranteed success
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sat, 24 Feb 2007 17:07:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Wow. Was that REALLY necessary? No, it wasn't. Either post something mature and that relates to this discussion, or just don't post

Now, as I said, it's a tactic you can use, in combination with others. It's not meant to be the ultimate destruction strategy. It's a simple one, but can do quite a bit of damage if used right.

It's like flanking. A well known tactic. Does it blow up an entire base easily? Not necessarily (Although, 4+ tanks coming from each side in a 10 vs 10 game might...). Does that make it a horrible tactic? No, it doesn't.

For some reason you view this as an awful tactic. It's one of Nod's better ones, and it utilizes their stealth quite well. GDI can't accomplish this, because it's fairly easy to spot an enemy who isn't an SBH in your base. "Element of surprise". Whatever you wish to call it, it can DEFINITELY throw them off guard even, if not destroy the target building. Sure, maybe it won't work 100% on it's own. That's why, again, it's a tactic, which can be employed with other tactics, hence my example.

I don't see how a flame rush (The numbers were an example if you had about 10 people vs 10 people, they can always vary), and a triple SBH rush needed the "Thanks for the laugh." comment. Again, I have won with this tactic.

You had also stated that it doesn't work in clan games. Was this tactic meant for clan games? I'm pretty sure it wasn't, it was meant for you to use it however. Yes, I did it in a public server. So what? This tactic wasn't meant specifically for a clan game, and if anything, was more for a public game. Hence, I've used it as such.

Now, in reply to your unchanged attitude of "Tanks are still better" logic, I have a question.

Wouldn't a mobile artillery (Which costs 50 more than SBH, not a big difference) be a BIT easier spot than an SBH? Yeah, I thought so. Sure, they can do more damage. Doesn't necessarily mean they're better.

Let's take mammoth tanks for example. They are well armored, have good firepower, and even a health regeneration. Oh my, it must be the BEST tank in existence, isn't it

Really now. Just because something is more powerful and has better armor, doesn't make it the best thing out there. But using your logic of "tanks are still better", the mammoth tank SHOULD be better, seeing as how it can fight pretty much everything

(Please note the sarcasm above in the correct places).

Now, once more, this tactic ISN'T for a great attack that can own everything. Like any strategy or tactic, it has it's flaws. Does it make it horrible? No, it doesn't. Does it suck as you said? Again, no, it doesn't.

Yes, a mine blowing up can usually alert someone that an SBH is there. But I think a tank will alert them more.

If they also have no barracks, then it's DEFINETLY a good attack, because of their lack of hotwires, and then most likely, mines.

Again, theres always the probability that atleast ONE of the SBH's will be killed. Still wise to try NOT to be killed, with any other tactic/strategy, but c'mon- You're GOING to die SOME time...

You also argue that, apperently, if you have 3 SBH's in that base, your base is going to get raped. Ugh. That's why I said that USUALLY 7+ people can stop some MRLS'. If they can't, you REALLY have some major idiots on your team. They can always buy tanks and even go into the field. 3 people missing in a 10 vs 10 game won't kill ya. Now, a small, 5 vs 5 game, yes, I'd be convinced.

I don't know what exactly you meant when you said it's worse in a 10 vs 10 game. Can't tell if you meant because you have less people than a 15 vs 15 game or even 20 vs 20, or if you meant because theres more people than a 5 vs 5 game or so.

If you meant it sucks in comparison to games with less people (Which I highly doubt), then please read my next paragraph.

If you meant it sucks in comparison to games with more people, not neccisarily. Sure, larger numbers can make make it better, but it can still work. Again, 3 people missing won't kill ya. Besides, it's definety better than 3 people in tanks getting killed then giving the enemy points.

Which brings me to another point. Er, points. Sorry, I can't quite avoid that being a bad pun. Anywho, tanks often give the enemy a lot of points. And if your enemy is smart, especially when they have less points, they'll probobly try to pointwhore and attack your tanks with a ramjet. Yeah, it won't kill em, but it gives them good amounts of points. And infantry, especially when far away, can be difficult to kill unless you're pretty accurate with a tank. Mobile arty's can MAYBE get rid of them, because of splash damage, but ramjets can take them out fairly easy (sadly).

Which brings me to yet another point. Buggy's and mobile arty's are around the same price range (Buggy's of course are less). But, they're not very well armored. And both are easy target for a ramjetter. A light tank is 600 credits- 200 more than an SBH. May not be a HUGE difference, but it shows that SBH's are a bit cheaper than Nod's average tank.

Your other 2 choices, for the same price as an SBH, or atleast around it are:

Nod buggy- Ok, since when have you EVER seen these around alot? They're about as useful as a chaingun to a mammoth tank when it comes to doing much damage to stuff. Their only use is anti infantry, or getting around fast. Well, the normal westwood maps aren't that big to begin with, so the "fast" part is kinda useless to have. I'd prefer a light tank or something over it. The anti infantry... Yeah, thats alright, but infantry vs infantry compared to buggy vs infantry would be a better choice.

Arty- Yes, this is a good choice, I'll admit. But it doesn't always get the job done. It's good for anti tank, or anti base if used correctly- But it gets killed FAR too easy. It's really only good if backed

up by some other tanks such as light tanks or whatever. It isn't your main force, so yeah. A good choice, but it's not so stealthy, and unless you can buy enough artillery's fast enough, get to their base, get in a position where you won't get killed easy, and can destroy a building, then that's good. But, the problem is, the trip to the base. It's fairly easy to spot 3 arty's, so stealth definitely is out of the question. Not only that, but they're fairly easy to kill, as I had said before. A group of grenadiers can probably take em out pretty quickly, and arty's aren't the best at avoiding fire due to their slow speed and large size.

The arty choice comes as a good competitor versus the 3 SBH attack. But, it really does depend on the situation.

Again, this isn't meant to be the ultimate destruction tactic. It's just one you can employ when need be. Hence, it takes a good field commander to know when and when not to use it. Just like any other tactic.

Oh yes, let's not forget the use of the thesaurus here. Sigh.

Quote:

Main Entry: strategy

Part of Speech: noun

Definition: plan

Synonyms: action, angle, approach, artifice, blueprint, brainchild, craft, cunning, design, game, game plan, gimmick, grand design, layout, maneuvering, method, plan, planning, policy, procedure, program, project, proposition, racket, scenario, scene, scheme, setup, slant, story, subtlety, system, tactics

That's the whole thing. Apparently, a strategy is also a gimmick, a game, a policy, and racket. Oh my, a strategy must wake up the neighbors then!!

Oh, and if you're going to use the dictionary as your facts in this debate...

Dictionary.com In military usage, a distinction is made between strategy and tactics. Strategy is the utilization, during both peace and war, of all of a nation's forces, through large-scale, long-range planning and development, to ensure security or victory. Tactics deals with the use and deployment of troops in actual combat.

Yeah, that's what I was referring to, the military distinction.

The strategy is the big, huge plan, and the tactic is the smaller stuff used in actual combat.

Cookie please
